Károly, K., Lázár, I., & Gall, C. (Eds.). (2020). *Culture and intercultural communication: Research and education* (pp.11-29). Budapest: School of English and American Studies, Eötvös Loránd University.

CULTURE TEACHING IN THE AGE OF GLOBAL ENGLISH

Magdolna KIMMEL
Eötvös Loránd University
kimmel.magdolna@btk.elte.hu

Abstract

Since English is primarily used as a contact language today, allegedly far removed from its cultural roots, the role of teaching target language culture(s) is contested. This paper argues that there is an important role for teaching target language cultures in ELT classrooms. The 21st century and its challenges, however, call for a new approach: if culture is conceptualized as discourse, the aim of culture teaching should be to help students understand the struggle going on between conflicting discourses, different cultural representations of the world. This necessitates the nurturing of students' symbolic competence, which helps them to achieve an in-depth, nuanced and critical understanding of target language cultures and their own, both in their heterogeneity and historicity.

1 Introduction

The late Edward Said was invited to visit a university in one of the Gulf states in the mid-80's and was then asked to evaluate their English programme and make recommendations for its improvement. He was disheartened to find that the curriculum was equally divided between linguistics (grammar and phonetic structure) and literary courses with a rigorously orthodox curriculum. Young Arabs dutifully read Milton, Shakespeare, Wordsworth, Austen and Dickens. Said notes they may as well have studied Sanskrit or medieval heraldry. On the positive side, he found that the English department attracted by far the largest number of students (Said, 1994, pp.368-369).

The reason why young Arabs flocked to the English department was that English emerged as the dominant means of international communication after World War 2. Its position as the global lingua franca was further strengthened after the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the Eastern Bloc. The English language is spoken by an estimated 1,120-1,880 billion people, of whom an estimated 320-380 million speak it as their native tongue (Crystal, 1997/2003, p.61). It is clear from these figures that more people speak English as their second language or as a foreign language than as their native tongue, and that the majority of interactions in English do not involve native speakers: English is primarily used as a contact language, a lingua franca.

This development results in a strong impetus towards instrumentalizing English language teaching. This seems to make sense: if English is thus removed from its native communities, what could be the point of teaching target language culture(s)? If teaching target language culture(s) still has a role, what exactly should it include? This is an important issue in public education, but can also be contested at college level. The curriculum described by Said as rigorously orthodox is the time-sanctioned

staple of English studies. Is it superfluous, or insufficient? Yet another question is what the curriculum of future English language teachers should comprise in terms of culture. They are going to get a diploma which says "teacher of English language and culture", not "teacher of the English language and literature". What is it they should be studying under the label 'culture'?

This article sets out to seek answers to these questions. First, I am going to explore how the English language emerged as a global language and next, whether this may mean the de-culturation /instrumentalization of the English language or not. Then two definitions of culture will be discussed in an effort to establish the potential content of culture teaching. The third section will discuss current approaches to teaching culture in English Language Teaching (ELT). The last part of this paper will explore an example of teaching cultural content in a recently published coursebook. In my conclusion I will try to answer the questions I set out to explore.

2 Global English

What makes a language global, apart from the number of its speakers? "A language achieves a genuinely global status when it develops a special role that is recognized in every country [...] even though they may have few (or no) mother-tongue speakers" (Crystal, 1997/2003, pp.3-4). Crystal obviously thinks that English has reached global status, as it has been granted a special status in some 75 polities (p.60). Not everybody agrees with this claim, though. Mufwene (2010) points out that English has become a global language in several domains, but not in all, even in countries like Singapore or Scandinavian countries, where it has practically reached second language status. He also argues that English has emerged as the language of international communication in those - mostly metropolitan - areas of the world which serve as an interface between the nation states to which they belong and the wider world. He suggests that the more globalized the economy of a country is, the wider the spread of English there will be.

Mufwene's description of how the world is getting more and more interconnected and interdependent, actually, may constitute a fairly nuanced and accurate picture of what is going on (c.f. the Economist, 2017, October 21st). However, it cannot be denied that the English language enjoys a special status in a number of key domains (trade, business, scholarship, the media, popular culture; for a full list see Crystal, 1997/2003) all over the world. Two research traditions emerged in Applied Linguistics (AL) in the wake of this development: World Englishes and English as lingua franca. The World Englishes (WE) tradition builds on Kachru's (1985) ground-breaking work: he created a three-concentric-circle model to depict the spread of English globally. In his model, countries where English is spoken as the native language occupy the inner circle, countries where it was adopted as a second language, whether as an intra-national lingua franca and/or an official language, are located in the Outer Circle, and countries where English is taught as a foreign language constitute the Expanding circle. The main thrust of Kachru's argument was that there is no longer only one English, the standard varieties spoken by the natives of the Inner-circle, but rather several. The Englishes spoken in the countries of the Outer Circle, India, Nigeria, Kenya, etc. – mostly in former colonies of Britain and now members of the Commonwealth – which are indigenized varieties of English, are just as worthy as the standards spoken in Inner circle countries. Kachru created his model in the 1980's, in the wake of world-wide de-colonization. His effort led to the codification of the prestigious, indigenized varieties of the English language spoken by the elites in the countries of the Outer circle, while other, hybrid varieties, spoken in their lower class communities, were relegated to secondary status (Dewey & Leung, 2010, p.6).

After the fall of the Berlin Wall, Kachru's model was no longer seen as an adequate representation of the role of English in the world. "Dissatisfaction has grown with a model of English that remained tied to national identities" (Pennycook, 1994/2017, p.ix). As English emerged as the most frequently used contact language among people from different linguistic backgrounds in an increasing number of domains, a new research tradition was established to examine English as a lingua franca (ELF), or English as an International Language (EIL). The difference between the two terms is that EIL is regarded as English used for communication *across and within* Kachru's three circles, whereas ELF is English used to communicate among people from different first language backgrounds (Seidlhofer, 2005, p.339). In the beginning, the main aim of ELF research was to find the shared elements of ELF, with a view to exploring the pedagogical consequences of the fact that most people are more likely to use the language to communicate with other non-native speakers than with native speakers (Seidlhofer, 2003; Dewey & Leung, 2010). The logic behind this effort was that since native speakers are now a minority of English speakers, and since a language is defined by its speakers, proficient non-native speakers of English are better equipped to define the English language used for cross-cultural communication than proficient native speakers (Modiano, 1999, p.25). However, ELF communication has so far proven too elusive and transitory for codification. It will stay that way, some claim, because ELF is "not a thing in itself", it is only a hypostatized form of the language, which obscures the reality of Englishes of various kinds in contact (O'Regan, 2014, p.539).

If we compare the two paradigms, we find that the basic difference between them is that the WE paradigm concerns itself with the description of the Englishes spoken by distinct speech communities, while the ELF paradigm concerns itself with the use of the English language in "highly variable, dynamic, often temporary and unstable interactional settings, typically involving speakers from a range of linguacultural backgrounds" (Dewey Leung, 2010, p.9). As a result of this, some scholars of the World Englishes tradition claim that ELF is a mono-model, in which "intercultural communication and cultural identity are to be made necessary casualties " (Rudby & Saraceni, 2006, as cited in Jenkins, 2009, p.202).

It is not difficult to see that the WE scholars have a point here: what could be the use of preparing students for intercultural communication through culture teaching, especially target language culture teaching, if the almost exclusive point of English language learning is instrumental: effective communication in transitory, fluid environments? But, there is another issue to be considered: to paraphrase Canagarajah (1999/2000, p.178), can a language willy-nilly separate itself from history, ideology, and social institutions - from its native culture(s)? This is the issue I will now turn to.

3 The relationship between language and culture

Pennycook (1994/2017, pp.7-11) claims that the rapid spread and acceptance of English all over the world is widely regarded as natural, neutral and beneficial in mainstream AL discourse. Natural, as it seems to be bound up with the processes of globalization, which are regarded as inevitable and unstoppable. Beneficial, because international English is widely seen as a means and facilitator of peaceful international cooperation between equal partners. Neutral, since English is now seen as a language detached from its native cultural contexts, a merely functional means of communication. It is this last statement that is of special importance here: can a language be consigned to the role of a mere functional tool? Or, on a more general level: can a language be 'de-culturized'?

A good many scholars argue that it cannot. Wierzbicka (1994) claims that each and every speech community has a system of cultural rules or scripts which

define what can be said and how: sociopragmatic rules. She also argues that in every speech community there are culturally charged concepts, entangled in different associative webs, networks of meaning, which make translation and mutual understanding difficult: for instance, the Russian concept of 'dusa' (soul) is one such concept. To translate it into English by merely providing the dictionary term 'soul' is deeply misleading. The true meaning of the term, the *symbolic* meaning it carries for native speakers of the Russian language, is lost in translation (Goddard & Wierzbicka, 1995, pp.47-48). Bennett (1997) offers a list of examples arranged under categories, including semantics, socio-pragmatics and grammatical structure, to show how language affects the way its speakers perceive and consequently interpret the world. McKay (2004, pp.5-9) lists three categories in which language and culture are bound together: semantics, pragmatics, and rhetoric. Clyne & Sharafian (2008, p.28.11) add one more element to the above list: "Language is also used to express cultural conceptualisations, such as cultural schema, that have developed among the members of a speech community across time and space." The concept of cultural schema clearly refers to something more than sociopragmatic norms or semantics: it refers to a certain "world view", or "cosmovision". Fantini (1997, p.12) asserts the same.

Risager (2005, p.189) says there are two diagonally opposite opinions on the connection between language and culture. Those working in anthropological linguistics, translation studies and intercultural communication argue that language and culture are inseparable. Those who study English as an international language claim the two are separable. She herself asserts that language in a generic sense is not separable from culture, and finds the generic sense in the psychological/cognitive and the social spheres, i.e., semantics and pragmatics. "Human culture always includes language and human language cannot be thought without culture. Linguistic practice is always embedded in, and is in interaction with, some cultural, meaningful context" (Risager, 2005, p.190). She suggests the term "languaculture" to denote language in the generic sense, based on the suggestion of the American anthropological linguist, Agar, who (1994) used the concept of "linguaculture" to express the inseparability of language and culture in terms of semantics and pragmatics. Risager (2005, p.190) uses the notion of "languaculture" to theorize how language and culture can be inseparable in one sense, the generic sense, but separable in the other, differential sense. In the differential sense, some aspects of culture, like musical traditions, fashion, architectural styles, food, norms, values, symbols, ideas and ideologies can be separated from language. Basically she claims that cultural products, among which she includes values, norms, ideas, etc., can be separated from language.

The argumentation, as we can see from the above examples, runs along the lines that a language and the culture it is rooted in are intertwined and inseparable in a good number of ways: semantics, pragmatics, rhetoric, even world-views. It is easy to accept this claim in the case of a native speaker community. If we consider the case of an indigenized variety of English, e.g. Indian English from this point of view, we will see that the language has been adopted to the local needs and local culture: this means that indigenized varieties of English are detached form their Inner-Circle, native roots, but, at the same time, they have become bound up with the local cultures they are now part of. Language and culture are again intertwined: the language became disconnected from one culture and reconnected with another culture. Consequently, the struggle for the legitimacy of these varieties meant, at the same time, a struggle for the equal status of the cultures they have become bound up with. Indian English or Nigerian English are now part and parcel of their native cultures, as well as a symbol of their identity. But whose culture is ELF or EIL intertwined with?

Jenkins (2009, p.202) claims that ELF speakers actually have a chance to validate their cultural identity through the use of ELF, by appropriating English and establishing their own varieties, like Japanese English, or Hungarian English for that matter. But,

then again, English is not culture-free, but is infused with the culture of the respective communities of its speakers, Japanese, or Hungarian. That is, Jenkins does not expect ELF to be culture-free: she expects it to get bound up with the native cultures of the speakers. Is this possible? According to Risager (2005) a learner of any foreign language will start using the new language according to the rules/norms of the languaculture of his/her first language. "Personal connotations to words and phrases will be transferred, and a kind of language mixture will result, where the foreign language is supplied with languacultural matter from another language" (Risager, 2005, p.192). Although she argues the learner will sooner or later supersede this level, he/she will never end up as an insider in the native languaculture. What Jenkins (2009) is arguing for is the emancipation of these varieties as legitimate varieties of English, not as 'interlanguages, imperfect Englishes of the learner, just like Outer Circle Englishes have been legitimized.

Therefore, one response to the above question, namely whose culture English is bound up with in English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts, is that it will get bound up with the native culture of the learners. But there is another response to this question. To get to this response, let us see, first of all, what kind of English is taught in EFL contexts. (In English as a Second Language (ESL) classrooms, where the aim is to integrate the learners into the community of native speakers this is a non-issue.) Dewey and Leung (2010, p.11) quote Howatt (2004), who established that textbook English is "the standard English used by educated people in all English-speaking countries". Although Dewey and Leung (ibid.) problematize the notion of 'standard', the fact of the matter is that textbook English is basically standard, usually British English, at least in our context. As Kramsch & Zhu (2016, p.40) say: "for example, when Hungary's national school system hires British-trained or native English teachers, and uses British textbooks to teach English in Hungarian public schools, is British English being taught as a foreign language to Hungary, or as an international second language or lingua franca?" We may safely say that this is the situation in a good many other EFL contexts, not just in Hungary: one of the standard varieties is taught, in some contexts British, in others American.

The second issue is what cultural content is included and thus taught in those coursebooks that are used to teach standard British or American English to learners who may, however, mostly use the language in ELF contexts. As early as 2002, Gray noted how English Language Teaching (ELT) coursebooks marketed internationally had been slowly de-territorialized, i.e. had shifted from a native speaker locality - like Britain - to international settings where English is used as a lingua franca between speakers of English from diverse backgrounds (Gray, 2002, p.157). One may claim that this happened as a reflection of the lingua franca role of English in the world, which was further strengthened after the disintegration of the Soviet bloc. The content in such materials reflects a global culture: it features global citizens, the beneficiaries of globalization, who enjoy the diversity and hybridity of 'the new age' and are no longer tied to the nation states they come from. Their lifestyle is that of the successful, affluent middle class citizen-consumer, which is presented as the global norm. This lifestyle is characterized by success, by self-agency, by not being dragged down by life's challenges and difficulties, by having enough expandable financial as well as cultural capital to enjoy the finer aspects of life (Block, 2010, p.296). As Phillipson (1992/2000, pp.280-283) noted, this is the functional argument to promote English as an international language, namely, to draw people's attention to what English does, what it can give access to. The lifestyle gives something the learners can aspire towards through mastering English: membership in a cosmopolitan, consumerist global citizenry, whose archetype is the affluent middle class of Western societies, which is pre-eminently influenced by Anglo culture(s), the US being the only super-power in the world. The language taught is standard British or American, the culture taught is a pre-eminently Western, essentially Anglo culture, packaged as "global culture".

This suggests that culture is taught in the language classroom even when one is inclined to believe that it is not. Canagarajah (1999/2000, pp.9-14) convincingly shows how even the most innocuous content, a day in the life of a person, can emanate first language (L1) cultural values. This is what Kramsch and Zhu (2016, p.40) refer to when they describe English as the language of aspiration towards "a multinational culture of modernity, progress and prosperity. This is the language of the 'American Dream', Hollywood, and pop culture that is promoted by the multinational U.S. and U.K. textbook industry, e.g. ESL taught to immigrants in the U.S. and the U.K., or in secondary schools in Hungary, Iraq and the Ukraine."

The important question to be considered at this point is how a language becomes an international language of aspiration. It does not happen because of its specific linguistic features, even though this argument was promoted back in the 19th century, when languages of colonial powers, primarily French and English, were competing for global lingua franca status. It happens because of its speakers' economic, technological and cultural power (Crystal, 1997/2003, p.7; Phillipson, 1992/2000, pp.52-53; Mufwene, 2010, p.81). As Rudby (2015) says:

> There is no such thing as a neutral playing field where all languages enjoy equal status. Power is real. This is particularly true of English and the power it wields today, derived from its link with British colonialism and imperialism, and strengthened more recently by its close interlocking with the corporatization of the world as embodied by the processes of globalization. The latter encompasses also English's dramatic monopolization of education, technology, culture, mass media, consumer values and lifestyles in many parts of the contemporary world. (p.42)

By declaring English to have been removed from its native communities, to have transformed into a value-free, culture-free lingua franca, the fact that its status is actually derived from the power of Inner Circle countries is obscured, thus creating a false consciousness for learners (O'Regan, 2014, pp.539-540).

Based on the above, it seems English has not been 'de-culturized'. Depending on its varieties, it may be bound up with one of its native culture(s), or with the culture of societies where it is spoken as a second language. In EFL contexts, like ours, the standard varieties are taught: this is the ever elusive goal towards which learners aspire. This standard variety of English is taught through a cultural content which depicts, mostly, the idealized life-style of a multinational affluent middle class, whose nationalities can be deduced from their names, but otherwise their essentially cosmopolitan culture emanates Anglo values and norms of behaviour. Therefore, one may describe the 'protagonists' of these books as multinational, but not as multicultural. The culture in the books is presented as universal, but it is not. It is a Western, primarily Anglo culture. Thus teaching about target language culture(s), or rather about a false and distorted representation of target language culture(s) is happening, although in a covert fashion, which creates a kind of 'false consciousness' in learners. I argue that it would be justified to make students aware of the culture-bound nature of these values and norms of behaviour. Firstly, these values are far from being universal: a good many cultures, no less worthy than target language culture(s), feature a different set of values, for example, a collectivist mindset. Individualism has a special, central role in the currently dominant target language culture, in the US. Furthermore, once Anglo values are proposed as universal, learners may be under the impression that these values and norms are the only valid, universally accepted ones, so if their culture is different, it is necessarily a second-rate, inferior one, from which they should distance themselves. Canagarajah (1999/2000, pp.22-23) and McKay (2002, p.95) describe examples of this happening in English classrooms. Last but not least, I also argue

that it could be of some use to present the target language cultures as complex, multicultural, heterogeneous societies, where groups with conflicting values, interests and lifestyles have to live together, and manage to live together, instead of promoting the image of an idealized middle class cosmopolitan consumerist citizenry. I believe that the reality of target language cultures could teach learners many useful lessons.

Since English does not seem to have been de-culturized at all, let us explore what cultural content should be taught. To clarify this, we need a definition of culture.

4 The concept of culture

Culture is a notoriously elusive concept, as all authors will readily accept. Meadows (2016, p.163) claims that the concept of culture in ELT, or more generally in foreign language pedagogy, has undergone a certain evolution: it has become more and more complex, as in every decade scholars added new and new layers to its definition. It is, therefore, perhaps best to limit our discussion to two conceptualizations which may be of some use when discussing the evolution of the content of culture teaching in ELT. The first definition differentiates between "Big C" culture and "small c" culture:

> [c]ulture in the broad sense has two major components. One is anthropological or sociological culture: the attitudes, customs, and daily activities of a people, their ways of thinking, their values, their frames of reference. Since language is a direct manifestation of this phase of culture, a society cannot be fully understood or appreciated without a knowledge of its language. The other component of culture is the history of civilization. Traditionally representing the 'culture' element in foreign language teaching, it includes geography, history and the achievements in the sciences and the arts. This second component forms the framework of the first: it represents the heritage of a people and as such must be appreciated by the students who wish to understand the new target culture. (Valette, 1986, p.179)

The above definition of culture is comprehensive enough to provide the framework for a thorough analysis of a group's culture, primarily for the analysis of a national culture. However, in the understanding of the concept of culture there has been an important shift from a concept of culture as products and behaviours to a concept of culture as meaning making. It started with the rise of semiotics, through the ground-breaking work of Saussure. According to semiotics, language can be regarded as a system of signs used as a means of communication. A 'sign' in and of itself is just a thing, it has no meaning. It only becomes a sign – a symbol of something – and acquires meaning when a human community agrees to attach a certain meaning to it (Szőnyi, 2014, p.74).

It is through language – and other systems of symbols – that we attach meaning to signs and create a representation of our world, which is, in effect, 'our culture'. Therefore, meanings can only be truly understood in the context of the culture they were produced in. Furthermore, no culture is static: each evolves over time, each has historicity. Thus to make sense of a representation, one has to place it in the specific historical period it was produced in. "Meanings are produced within history and culture. They can never be finally fixed but are always subject to change, both from one cultural context into another and from one period into another" (Hall, 1997, p.32). The meanings we attach to things – i.e. our culture – change through changes that take place in our communities' discourse and discursive practices. A discourse is more than a stretch of writing or speech, as it is usually defined in linguistics. Discourse in this sense is the language a community uses in a certain period of time to talk about a topic, and also a set of rules and conventions which regulate how a topic can be talked about in a community. This latter is called "discursive practice" (Hall, 1997, pp.44-45).

It follows from the above that successful communication through the use of a system of signs – like a language - necessitates the presence of an interpretive community, which agrees on the meanings attached to the signs. The next question, then, should be how an interpretive community is formed. The starting point to understand this may be Clifford Geertz's (1973, quoted in Szőnyi, 2014, p.74) definition: "Culture is the ensemble of stories we tell ourselves about ourselves". Szőnyi (2014) explains this definition as follows:

> the phrase "stories" refers to textuality, but also to the fact that these stories are made up, are constructed. It means that culture is to some extent fictitious. The phrase, "about ourselves" indicates self-reflexivity and self-representation; "telling [to] ourselves" suggests that there is a community, which circulates the stories for the purpose of identity-formation and identity consolidation. With the help of these stories we recognize ourselves as individuals, at the same time members of a community. The recognition happens as a result of an interpretive act, the community possessing the stories is thus … becoming an interpretive community. (p.74)

What kind of communities can serve as interpretive communities? A nation is an example of such a community (Anderson, 2006, p.6). Can there be several different ensembles of stories of a nation? Certainly. The North and the South have been telling themselves different stories about the American Civil War. Certainly the stories that African–Americans are telling themselves about the Civil War are different from the stories of whites from the North and the South as well. Interpretive communities may also be based on class, ethnicity, sexual orientation, political views etc. within a country, but also on a global scale, trans-nationally. The different discourses of different interpretive communities are constantly vying for recognition and/or for dominance within the mainstream discourse of countries, as well as on the global stage.

In this section two definitions or conceptualizations of culture have been discussed. Culture can be understood as the 'Big C', i.e., institutional/achievement culture and 'small c', i.e., behaviour culture of a group. It can also be understood as the cultural representation – meaning – of the world created by a group through language, through discourse. This is constantly changing and evolving through the inner struggle going on within the group, and due to external influences as well. Discourses are not bound to a group, like a nation, they may supersede cultural boundaries; for instance, the discourse of the Enlightenment or Protestantism. Let us see now how these conceptualizations of culture appear in the teaching of culture in foreign language classrooms.

5 Two current approaches to culture teaching in ELT

Several authors have provided an overview of how culture teaching has featured within foreign language teaching (Lo Bianco, Liddicoat, & Crozet, 1999; Risager, 2012; Kramsch, 2013; Meadows, 2016). Kramsch (2013) and Risager (2012) both argue that there are two basic approaches to culture teaching today: modernist and postmodernist, which coexist.

Kramsch (2013, pp.64-69) distinguishes two major paradigms within the modernist approach: the humanistic tradition focusing primarily on the literature and the arts of the target language group, i.e., elements of "Big C" culture. With the advent of the communicative approach in the early 1980's, the focus of culture teaching shifted to "small c" cultural elements, teaching about the patterns of everyday life in the target language communities. This turn, however, often led to essentializing

cultures, to teaching stereotypes, ignoring the heterogeneity and historicity of target language cultures. She assigns both teaching "Big C culture" and "small c culture" to the modernist paradigm by virtue of the fact that both are grounded in the notion of the "one nation", "one culture", "one standard language" tradition.

Kramsch (2013, p.70) also assigns to this category the currently dominant Intercultural Speaker model of culture teaching, which was proposed by Byram in 1997, based on the fact that it still focuses on comparing L1 and L2 cultures. Since this is the dominant model of culture teaching in foreign language pedagogy, it is necessary to examine it in detail. Developing learners' Intercultural Communicative Competence (ICC) is the centrepiece of this model. ICC includes two major areas: communicative competence, comprising linguistic, sociolinguistic and discourse competence and cultural competence, comprising knowledge, skills, attitudes and critical cultural awareness. An Intercultural Speaker is able to occupy "a third place" (Kramsch, 1993, pp.233-259), a vantage point from which he/she is capable of reflecting on his/her own culture and the target culture alike, and to understand culture as difference (McKay, 2002, pp.82-83).

To develop learners' Intercultural Competence, Byram (1997) clearly argues for a comparative approach, for comparing L1 and L2 cultures. This is clear from his description of the knowledge component of "Intercultural Communicative Competence" (Byram, 1997, pp.58-61). He says that such comparisons serve as *models/examples* of how cultures work and *how cultures* can be explored (emphases added). The knowledge and skills acquired in the process can be used later for similar cultural explorations, or in inter-national communicative situations for which the learners were not directly prepared (Byram, 1997, p.20). However, he stresses that it is important not to simply raise students' awareness of the differences between their home culture and the target culture, but also to make sure that they develop an awareness of their own culture's peculiarities, of how it looks relative to the other culture, from another perspective. In Byram's model, the intercultural speaker's critical cultural awareness, i.e., their ability to critically appreciate their own and others' culture without bias takes central place. Focusing only on the differences may result in a reinforced ethnocentric world-view, he claims. In contrast, if someone manages to change perspectives and see the complexity of a foreign culture from the inside, and his/her own culture from the outside, changing perspectives may be easier next time, when engaging in communication with non-native speakers from diverse cultural backgrounds. He also emphasizes the importance of presenting the complexity of the target culture as well as its dynamics, its evolution over time. In short, the teaching of inner circle cultures in this conceptualization does not serve to perpetuate their primacy, but rather as an experiment on the learners' behalf to change perspectives, which is a precondition for cultural appreciation and learning (1997, pp.19-20).

Even though the Intercultural Speaker model is still the most widely accepted model today, Meadows (2016) observed that a new trend has been evolving within it: while reviewing the culture teaching related professional literature up to 2015, he noted that there has been in the 21st century a gradual shift away from culture-specific cultural knowledge towards culture-general cultural knowledge.

> One might imagine a painting hanging on a museum wall. The oil painting inside of the frame can be seen as the teachable content in a culture-specific orientation. Take away the painting and only the frame is left. That frame becomes the content for culture teaching under the culture-general orientation. (Meadows, 2016, p.156)

The transition towards a focus on culture-general knowledge means that the comparison of L1 and L2 cultures is no longer seen as relevant. ICC is to be developed by critical self-reflection, which will prepare the learners for unpredictable cultural

settings. However, it is difficult to see what the learners will reflect on: their own interpretive frame? But their interpretive frame is culturally determined and can only be explored and reflected upon when compared to another person's interpretive frame, also determined by his/her culture. Removing Inner Circle cultures from the frame, and replacing them with other cultures, does not seem to be unproblematic, either. Discussing cultural content from a third (not L1 or L2) culture may be difficult for teachers of English. McKay (2002, 2004) discusses this matter in some detail. She says the disadvantage can be that the third culture content may be alien to both learners and the teacher, and the latter may be unable to find additional information about it. The learners may thus find the content puzzling, uninteresting, even demotivating. The advantage can be that learners may meet examples of successful intercultural communication through the use of English (McKay, 2002, pp.92-93, 2004, pp.12-13). While her argument for third culture teaching is certainly valid, I argue that even if teachers find additional information on the third culture, their understanding of the information may be limited, or, what is even worse, superficial, stereotypical or even distorted. Using universal criteria for cultural analysis – like Hofstede's (Hofstede, Hofstede, & Minkov, 2005) cultural dimensions – may result in essentializing cultures. Also, the concept of cultural dimensions can be best grasped through specific examples. It is only after learners have gained a thorough understanding of cultural dimensions through specific examples that we can hope that they can use them successfully as an interpretive framework, and even then they must be used with caution. Therefore, one is tempted to say that it is through the in-depth analysis of specific cultures that someone can best learn how to explore and empathize with other cultures. In the absence of specific cultural content, what is left is 'attitude formation', the importance of which should not be underestimated. However, it is questionable to what extent general goodwill, tolerance, curiosity and flexibility will prove sufficient when someone faces deeply rooted value differences, conflicting interests, or hostility. One may also wonder whether respect, tolerance, or, for that matter, human rights carry the same meaning in all cultures.

Now, turning back to the perceived change of focus in the Intercultural Speaker model, the question arises: What may have motivated this change? Probably the vast changes that Kramsch describes as follows:

> in our days of exacerbated migrations, global mobility, and global modes of communication, culture … has become something that *individuals* carry about in their heads when they leave home, migrate to another country, settle down in a third and they raise their children who will spend much of their days online and on the internet. The national culture that is generally associated with a national language is being problematized by the increasingly diverse populations of post-industrial societies. (Kramsch, 2018, p.18)

It may be useful to keep in mind, though, that this is how the world looks from a certain subject position in the world. As Mufwene (2010) points out, globalization has impacted upon different areas of the globe to a different extent.

Still, the change of focus in the Intercultural Speaker model may have happened due to these changes. To meet the challenge posed by the 21st century, Kramsch (2013) promotes a new, postmodern or late modern view of culture, which focuses on culture as discourse, which she defines as "something that offers various ways of meaning-making through various symbolic systems" (p.356). Discourses are not necessarily limited to a national culture, so focusing on them may be a more adequate response to the challenge of a rapidly globalizing world than the "empty frame". As Risager (2012, p.193) asserts, the concept of languaculture is bound to a specific language and culture, but discourse is not: discourses transcend the boundaries of languacultures.

For example, the discourse of Christianity is not bound to any specific language, though some languages may be better positioned to verbalize it, she says.

Kramsch (2013) argues that the late-modern approach "manages not to lose the historicity of local national speech communities while attending to the subjectivity of speakers and writers who participate in multiple global communities" (p.70). Two words stand out here: subjectivity and historicity. Culture is regarded as subjective, something individuals carry in their heads, not geographically bounded to nation states. Subjectivity means that each and every person enjoys access to a unique motley of cultures – of which national culture is only one – and he/she is free "to gain a voice," to establish an identity, by negotiating a space through the available discourses. Subjectivity "provides subjects with the possibility of forming new identities and gaining a critical consciousness by resisting dominant discourses" (Canagarajah, 1999/2000, p.31). I argue that one cannot negotiate a position, gain recognition and carve out an identity for oneself through any discourse without having a thorough knowledge and critical understanding of the competing and contested discourses of the world, many of which, the dominant ones, clearly emanate from English-Speaking – Inner Circle – cultures.

The other new word is historicity. Why does Kramsch insist on not losing the historicity of local speech communities if she asserts, as we have seen above, that national cultures are being eroded as a result of global migration and emerging hybrid societies? Her definition of culture can answer that question: "Cultures are *portable schemas* of interpretation of actions and events that people have acquired through primary socialization and which change as people migrate or enter into contact with people who have been socialized differently" (emphasis added) (Kramsch, 2018, p.20).

Though people in the 21st century tend to migrate globally and live in hybrid communities, the culture(s) they were enculturated into still define their "portable schemas". Thus understanding the historicity of other cultures – nations, ethnic groups, genders, classes, religions – and thus the historical experiences of the Other – is of key importance from the point of view of effective cross-cultural communication. As Kramsch (2006) puts it when arguing that mere communicative competence is insufficient for successful cross-cultural communication:

> the exacerbation of global social and economic inequalities and of ethnic identity issues, as well as the rise in importance of religion and ideology around the world have created *historical and cultural gaps* that a communicative approach to teaching cannot bridge in itself. In order to understand others, *we have to understand what they remember from the past, what they imagine and project onto the future and how they position themselves in the present. And we have to understand the same things of ourselves.* (emphases added) (pp.250-251)

Instead of "the empty frame" which the Intercultural Speaker model according to Meadows (2016, p.156) proposes in response to the challenges of the 21st century, Kramsch (2006) promotes focusing on discourses and as an aim she sets the development of the symbolic competence (SC) of learners. Later, in an annotated bibliography on SC, this 2006 article of hers is referred to as "A first attempt to define SC as the ability to manipulate symbolic systems, to interpret signs and their multiple relations to other signs, to use semiotic practices to make and convey meaning, *and to position oneself to one's benefit in the symbolic power game*. SC is nourished by a literary imagination." (Emphasis added) (Kramsch & Whiteside, 2015a, p.3) However, if we carefully read through this annotated bibliography, we will see that the concept of symbolic competence has been interpreted, critiqued and elaborated on by various scholars in numerous ways; that is, it has proven to be a rather elusive concept.

Symbolic competence is perhaps best grasped through reference to two slides from a presentation by Kramsch & Whiteside (2015b). On the first slide we see a number of people happily communicating with each other, while one person is standing apart, excluded and unable to get involved. The question she poses on the next slide is whether the excluded person lacks one or several components of communicative competence or intercultural competence, or lacks 'symbolic competence', which is defined as the ability to play the power game, having institutional legitimacy, and having the power to reframe the context. The point is that it is his inability to position himself to his advantage in the symbolic power game – i.e., his lack of symbolic competence – that makes it impossible for him to make his voice heard.

How does symbolic competence work? Symbolic competence is exercised through *symbolic representation:* by classifying and categorizing the world, e.g., categorizing social actors as freedom fighters or terrorists. Those who have the power to categorize and classify the world have the power to make others live in the social world as defined by them (Kramsch & Whiteside, 2015b, Bourdieu, 1991, pp.105-106). Symbolic competence is exercised through *symbolic action,* by performing speech acts. This is again a power game, since only those who are invested with symbolic power through the institutions of society are recognized as legitimate speakers. For example, an order issued by a private to an officer will not be obeyed, since a private lacks 'symbolic power', i.e. institutional legitimacy (Bourdieu, 1991, pp.74-75). Last but not least, symbolic competence is exercised through *symbolic power*, which is "the power to construct social reality," through which we construe our cultures and identities, as well as produce, reproduce or subvert dominant discourses. (Kramsch & Whiteside, 2015b) These are essentially the three facets of discourse as a symbolic system: symbolic representation, symbolic action and symbolic power.

The most important element in Kramsch's conceptualization of discourse as a symbolic system is "symbolic power". Symbolic power is "What creates the power of words and slogans, a power capable of maintaining or subverting the social order, is the belief in the legitimacy of words and of those who utter them. And words alone cannot create this belief" (Bourdieu, 1991, p.170). Discourse as symbolic power can be understood as having the power, the economic and the social capital to define what topics can be talked about and how within specific cultures, some of which, however, in our globalized world, do transcend the boundaries of their nation states. 'To gain a voice' is to recognize discourses as being tied to symbolic power, and to be able to make an informed and conscious decision to espouse them or subvert them.

What Kramsch (2013) proposes as a post-modern approach to the study of culture is based on a concept of culture as discourse, as meaning-making, culture as representations created through discursive practices. Teaching culture in this fashion, however, is a highly complex task, and points towards an interdisciplinary field of study, Cultural Studies. Furthermore, not only does teaching culture as cultural representations call for an interdisciplinary approach, but "It is also important to emphasize that since cultural representations are tied to specific periods from the past to the present, one of the most important aspects of their study is the historical approach and contextualization" (Szőnyi, 2014, p.75).

It is difficult to see how such a complex way of approaching culture may play out in the context of EFL or ESL classrooms, even though Kramsch (2011, pp.362-364), Byram and Kramsch (2008), Kearney (2012) and Vinall (2016) present examples, though mostly for college level foreign language classes. Kramsch proposed the idea of symbolic competence first in 2006, and in her article she argues for developing learners' symbolic competence through teaching target language literature. However, she thinks the orthodox approach exemplified in the extract from Said (1994) in the Introduction of this paper certainly will not do. As she puts it: "we certainly do not need a return to textual exegesis or to the study of author, period and style of first year

German" (2006, p.251). One is tempted to believe that this kind of approach to culture teaching at college level calls for an integration between the traditional studies of language, studies of literature and studies of history and society, which Risager (2012, p.195) so convincingly argues for. She thinks an interdisciplinary approach to foreign and second language studies is needed, in which complex problems are interpreted and analysed with various means from various viewpoints. For a potential example of how this may be done I am turning now to a mainstream coursebook: *Solutions Advanced Third Edition* (Falla & Davies, 2017) which, in my view, attempts to develop learners' symbolic competence.

6 Teaching culture as discourse in its historicity and contextuality

Solutions Advanced Third Edition was published in 2017. The series is fairly popular in Hungary, though only a minority of students reach an advanced level and thus use this volume. The book consists of nine units, and there are nine culture-focussed supplements carefully linked to each unit but added as a kind of extra at the end of the book. Each supplement comprises a history (context) and a literature page. All Culture Supplements focus on Inner-Circle cultures, the UK and the US in roughly equal proportion.

The topics touched upon in the nine units neatly fit into the categories that Block (2010, pp.296-299) identified as featuring in most ELT materials intended for global consumption:

- success – people, dead or alive, celebrities or ordinary people who have achieved success or are on their way to achieve success;
- emotional life – a lot of units deal with psychological topics, either general topics rooted in psychological research, or more self-revelatory ones, on friends, family, siblings, childhood memories, finding a partner or topics like sleeping habits or the influence of language on one's way of thinking;
- lifestyle related topics; hobbies, travel, popular culture, films and novels, literature.

It must be noted that apart from global issues, e.g. environmental issues, the units themselves include political, historical and cultural topics, like nuclear power, the Iraq war, WikiLeaks, migration, the Vietnam war, Watergate, and the Civil Rights movement. It can be seen from this list that the book is heavily infused with L1 culture-related content, but its willingness to address delicate issues provides a more realistic picture of L1 cultures as well as of the world.

Out of the nine Cultural Supplements – due to space constraints – I am going to comment on one with an American cultural focus. This, in my view, lends itself to developing symbolic competence by helping learners to grasp the sense of culture as an arena of competing discourses at a point of time in history. The supplement is about the Civil War, and it may be used to invite learners to examine it from three perspectives: that of the slave owners, the abolitionists (John Brown) and the slaves. The three perspectives are complemented by a fourth, provided by the embedded literary work, Louisa May Alcott's 'Little Women', which is set in the same historical era. By involving the figure of John Brown yet another issue can be brought to the spotlight: using violence to achieve an aim. By working through the supplement the learners can "demonstrate critical literacy, i.e., meaning-making and perspective-taking practices in the analysis of cultural and historical narratives," which is a way of nurturing symbolic competence (Heidenfeldt & Vinall, 2017, p.7).

In Unit 6, to which this supplement is connected, Martin Luther King's "I have a dream" speech is discussed. Four historians' shed light on the contemporary reception of the speech, thus helping us put the text into historical context. This truly symbolic

speech could be usefully analysed with the help of the questions Kramsch compiled to support teachers and learners to place any piece of text in a wider discourse, in a historical context, as well as to explore its intertextuality:

- Not which words, but whose words are those? Whose discourse? Whose interests are being served by this text?
- What made these words possible and others impossible?
- How does the speaker position himself/herself?
- How does he frame the events she is talking about?
- What prior discourses does he/she draw on? (Kramsch, 2011, p.360)

Working through the text, it is not only the Civil Rights movement that can be discussed, but the cultural revolution of the 1960's, as well as the concept of the 'American Dream'. Each of these can be regarded as cultural representations, transcending national boundaries. The cultural revolution of the 60's swept through the whole world; it was not limited to one country. The American Dream has its intellectual roots in ancient Greece, Protestantism and the ideas of the Enlightenment (Freese, 1987). It impacted, however, not only on Europeans. (See Takaki (1989/1998) on how the idea of the American Dream impacted on Asians and fuelled immigration.) Furthermore, teaching this unit and supplement may also help or even force students to confront their own culture's discourses on race.

One may ask, though: how does this all help intercultural communication between a Hungarian and a Czech who use English as a lingua franca? When two interlocutors are engaged in instrumental/functional communication, like a business transaction, where it is in both parties' interest to successfully conclude the transaction, this may not help, though the ability to see a situation from different perspectives should be useful. However, intercultural communication is not limited to business transactions or other, by and large functional, interactions. It also includes communication regarding other, historical, ideological, cultural, social etc. issues, conflicts and differences between people with different 'cosmovisions' (Fantini, 1997, p.12). Covering this supplement and Martin Luther King's speech can also lead to a discussion of how the cultural revolution of the 60's played out in the 'Eastern Bloc', the Prague Spring and Hungary's dismal role in crushing it.

How could this knowledge promote better understanding between Czechs and Hungarians? It is bound to result in just the opposite, one might claim. This may be true. But I argue that this is only true if the Czechs and Hungarians lack the symbolic competence to re-frame their post-1945 history. They were both represented in mainstream discourses as 'Eastern Bloc' countries till the change of the regimes, and even today are often referred to as Eastern Europeans. The fact that they have always classified themselves as Central Europeans – and for very good reasons - and neither nation chose to belong to the 'Eastern Bloc' in the first place, seems to have been comfortably forgotten. Thus the symbolic power to re-frame reality - a component of symbolic competence - may help better communication between Czechs and Hungarians when they are using English as a lingua franca.

Seeing oneself through the eyes of the Other can be an edifying experience for all concerned, though it is hardly an easy task. However, only through seeing oneself through a different mirror can the individual's 'symbolic competence' develop, and reach a point when one is prepared to get engaged in the 'power game of discourses', when one is prepared 'to gain a voice'.

However, it must be admitted that it would be difficult to adopt such an approach to target language culture teaching in secondary, let alone primary English classrooms. It may be feasible to a certain extent if the school implements a curriculum based on the interconnectedness of subjects. Furthermore, the education of future English language teachers must also be adapted if such an approach is to

be followed. How the symbolic competence of English language teachers could be nurtured is an unexplored area, since literature on developing symbolic competence mostly focuses on activities for college majors (Back, 2016, p.20). I argue that nurturing the SC of future teachers of English should be attempted in university level teacher education even if the approach is unlikely to take root in public education, since we need teachers who have an understanding of the post-modern world, which is growing into a clamouring motley of discourses vying for dominance. Symbolic competence is of special importance in the case of Anglo cultures, since their impact has been the most wide-ranging and profound in the world.

7 Conclusions

In this paper I set out to examine whether English can be taught and learnt deprived of cultural content. My conclusion was that a language, even when it is used as a means of international communication, carries a culture; EIL seems to carry the cultural norms of an (imagined/emergent) global citizenry, moulded in the likeness of Western, primarily Anglo cultures. Thus I find it difficult to see why it would be beneficial for a learner not to have a clear concept of what culture(s) she/he is immersed in through the English language classes, namely the Inner Circle countries of Kachru's (1985) model, and why it would not be useful to provide an opportunity for them to gain a more in-depth understanding of these cultures.

My second question was what the content of culture teaching should be. I elaborated on two definitions of culture. The first conceptualizes culture as achievements/products and behaviours, the second one defines culture primarily as cultural representation, as meaning-making through discursive practice. The two definitions provided the cornerstone for the overview of how cultural content has been and is being taught in the EFL classrooms. The currently dominant paradigm of culture teaching, the Intercultural Speaker model, aims to create a sphere of interculturality: the learner is invited to step outside his/her own culture, see it from the outsiders' point of view, while assuming an insiders' view of the other culture. This approach necessitates the teaching of L1 culture alongside L2 culture, in a contrastive fashion, providing a panoramic view of both cultures, in their totality, both their 'Big C' and 'small c' aspects. Recently the content component of the model seems to have shifted from culture-specific to culture-general knowledge, or rather to 'attitude formation', as a response to the challenges of the 21st century. This response, though its significance cannot be denied, may prove insufficient in a world where historically rooted 'culture wars' rage between people espousing different cultural representations of the world.

In response to the same challenges, Kramsch (2006) suggested the development of students' symbolic competence. She claimed that given the post-modern, rapidly globalizing and transitory world, the hybrid and/or virtual communities we live in today, it is necessary to nurture in learners the ability to critically appreciate the competing discourses of the world in their historicity (Kramsch, 2013). It is through these discourses that learners have to negotiate a position, an identity for themselves. These discourses transcend the boundaries of nation states, but since the English-speaking cultures of the Inner Circle exert a tremendous influence all over the globe through their economic, military, cultural and political power, it is essential to have an in-depth awareness and understanding of their discourses. Therefore, teaching and learning about L1 cultures - understood here as cultural representations - is a must for learners of the language even if English is used in the world primarily as a lingua franca. The answer to the question of whether target language culture should still be taught even though English serves today as a lingua franca is then a definite yes.

The next question concerned the content of culture teaching at college level. It seems that the 21st century calls for a new understanding of culture, which focuses primarily on "culture as shared meaning-making", the discourse and the discursive practices of a group through which cultural representations are constructed and reconstructed over time. To teach culture as a meaning-making process, which unfolds through time, necessitates an interdisciplinary approach. At the college level this approach may point towards the increased integration of the now separated strands of linguistics, literature and historical/societal studies of English. In the context of public education an interconnectedness of subjects and the teamwork of different subject specialists may help to nurture students' symbolic competence. The third question was what kind of cultural component should be included in the education of future teachers of English, if any, given that most of their students will only be interested in the instrumental use of the language. I would argue that they do need "symbolic competence", if we conceptualize their roles as language educators and not just as language instructors.

Nurturing the symbolic competence of learners is certainly a challenge. However, the alternative, instrumentalizing English language teaching, is an option which strengthens a mono-lingual and mono-cultural mindset, which may prove downright dangerous. Let me refer back to another observation of the late Edward Said, whom I quoted in the Introduction and now wish to quote again. This is still about his visit to one of the universities of a Gulf state:

> [t]he reason for the large number of students taking English was given frankly by a somewhat disaffected instructor: many of the students proposed to end up working for airlines or banks, in which English was the worldwide *lingua franca*. This all but terminally consigned English to the level of a technical language stripped of expressive and aesthetic characteristics, and denuded of any critical or self-conscious dimension. ….The other thing I discovered, to my great alarm, was that English such as it was existed in what seemed to be a seething cauldron of Islamic revivalism. (Said, 1994, pp.368-369)

This is what happens when the learning of a foreign language is deprived of its cultural dimension: it ceases to serve the noblest of its aims, i.e. learning about ourselves through learning about the Other, and thus strengthening the feeling of our shared humanity.

References

Agar, M. (1994). *Language shock. Understanding the culture of conversation*. New York: Quill/William Morrow.

Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined communities. Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism.* Revised edition. London, New York: Verso.

Back, M. (2016). Symbolic competence in interaction: Mutuality, memory, and resistance in a peer tutoring context. *L2 Journal*, *8*(3), 1-22. Online. Available: https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8pf7781b

Bennett, J. M. (1997). How not to be a fluent fool: Understanding the cultural dimension of language. In A. Fantini (Ed.), *New ways in teaching culture* (pp. 16-21). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Block, D. (2010). Globalization in language teaching. In N. Coupland (Ed.), *The handbook of language and globalization* (pp. 287-304). Oxford, Chichester: Wiley, Blackwell, Malden.

Bourdieu, P.(1991) *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, Oxford: Polity Press in association with Basil Blackwell. Retrieved 27 June, 2019, from: https://monoskop.org/images/4/43/Bourdieu_Pierre_Language_and_Symbolic_Power_1991. pdf

Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Clevedon, GB: Multilingual Matters.

Byram, K., & Kramsch, C. (2008). Why is it so difficult to teach Language as culture? *The German Quarterly, 81*(1), 20-34. DOI: 10.1111/j.1756-1183.2008.00005.x Retrieved 24 May, 2019, from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/229972327

Canagarajah, S. (2000). *Resisting imperialism in English teaching*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Clyne, M. G., & Sharafian, F. (2008). English as an international language: Challenges and possibilities. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics. International Forum on English as an International Language, 31*(3). Special issue edited by M. G. Clyne, & F. Sharafian. 28.1-28.16. DOI: 10.2104/aral0828

Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a global language*. 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dewey, M. and Leung, C. (2010). English in English language teaching: Shifting values and assumptions in changing circumstances. *Working Papers in Educational Linguistics*, *25*(1), 1-15.

Fantini, A. E. (1997). Language: Its cultural and intercultural dimensions. In A. Fantini (Ed.), *New ways in teaching culture* (pp. 3-15). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Freese, P. (1987). *The American dream and the American nightmare*. Paderborn: Rektorat der Universität-Gesamthochschule-Paderborn.

Goddard, C., & Wierzbicka, A. (1995). Key words, culture and cognition 1. Introductory remarks. *Philosophica, 55*(1), 37-67.

Gray, J. (2002). The global coursebook in English language teaching. In D. Block, & D. Cameron (Eds.), *The handbook of language and globalization* (pp.151-167). London, New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis. Retrieved 30th May, 2019, from: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/David_Block4/publication/31309691

Hall, S.(1997). The work of representation. In S. Hall (Ed.), *Representation: Cultural representation and signifying practices* (pp. 15-64). London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications, in association with the Open University.

Howatt, A. P. R., with Widdowson, H. G. (2004). *A history of English language teaching* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heidenfeldt, W., & Vinall, K. (2017). Symbolic competence: From theory to pedagogical practice. Introduction to the Special Issue. *L2 Journal, 9*(2), 3-11. Retrieved 29 May, 2019, from: http://blc.berkeley.edu/l2_journal/

Hofstede, G., Hofstede, J., & Minkov, M. (2005). *Cultures and organizations. Software of the mind. Intercultural cooperation and its importance for survival*. Revised and expanded edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Jenkins, J. (2009). English as a lingua franca: Interpretations and attitudes. *World Englishes*, *28*(2), 200-207. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467 971X.2009.01582.x

Kachru, B. B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: the English language in the outer circle. In R. Quirk, & H. G. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the world: Teaching and learning the language and literatures*. Cambridge: The British Council.

Kearney, E. (2012). Perspective-taking and meaning-making through engagement with cultural narratives: Bringing history to life in a foreign language classroom. *L2 Journal, 4*(1), 58-82. Retrieved 2 June 2019, from: http://blc.berkeley.edu/l2_journal

Kramsch, C. (1993). *Context and culture in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kramsch, C. (2006). From communicative competence to symbolic competence. *The Modern Language Journal, 90*(2), 249-252. Retrieved 18 May, 2019 from https://www.jstor.org/stable/3876875

Kramsch, C. (2011). The symbolic dimensions of the intercultural. *Language Teaching*, *44*(3), 354-367. DOI:10.1017/S0261444810000431

Kramsch, C. (2013). Culture in foreign language teaching. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research, 1*(1), 57-78. Retrieved 22 May, 2019, from: https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1127430

Kramsch, C., & Whiteside, A. (2015a). Annotated bibliography on symbolic competence. Retrieved 26th June, 2019, from http://blc.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Symbolic-competence-annotated-bibliography.pdf

Kramsch, C., & Whiteside, A. (2015b). What is symbolic competence and what can we do with it? [PDF document] Retrieved 11 June, 2019 from http://blc.berkeley.edu/wpcontent/uploads/2015/08/kramschSC.pdf

Kramsch, C. (2018). Is there still a place for culture in a multilingual FL education? *Language Education and Multilingualism, 1*, 16-33. Retrieved 23 May, 2019 from https://edoc.hu-berlin.de/bitstream/handle/18452/19780/LEM-2018_Kramsch.pdf?sequence=1

Kramsch, C., & Zhu H. (2016). Language, culture and language teaching. In G. Hall (Ed.), *Routledge handbook of English language teaching* (pp.38-50). London: Routledge. Retrieved 11 June, 2019 from http://eprints.bbk.ac.uk/15690/1/Language%20and%20culture%20in%20ELT.pdf

Lo Bianco, J., Liddicoat, A. J., & Crozet, Ch. (Eds.). (1999). *Striving for the third place: Intercultural competence through language education*. Deakin: Australian National Languages and Literacy Institute. Retrieved 7 June, 2019 from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED432918.pdf

McKay, S. L. (2002). *Teaching English as an international language*. New York: Oxford University Press.

McKay, S. L. (2004). Teaching English as an international language: The role of culture in Asian contexts. *The Journal of Asia TEFL, 1*(1), 1-22.

Meadows, B. (2016). Culture teaching in historical review: On the occasion of ASOCOPI's fiftieth anniversary. *HOW, Online, 23*(2), 148-169. Retrieved 12 June, 2019 from http://dx.doi.org/10.19183/how.23.2.294

Modiano, M. (1999). International English in the global village. *English Today, 15*(2), 22-28. DOI: 10.1017/S026607840001083X

Mufwene, S. S. (2010). Globalization, global English, and world English(es): Myths and facts. In N. Coupland (Ed.), *The handbook of language and globalization* (pp.31-56.). Oxford, Chichester: Wiley, Blackwell, Malden.

O'Regan, J. P. (2014). English as a lingua franca: An immanent critique. *Applied Linguistics, 35*(5), 533–555. DOI:10.1093/applin/amt045

Pennycook, A. (1994/2017). *The cultural politics of English as an international language.* London, New York: Routledge, Taylor and Francis.

Phillipson, R. (2000). *Linguistic imperialism*. 5th edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Risager, K. (2005). Languaculture as a key concept in language and culture teaching. In B. Preisler, A. Fabricius, H. Haberland, S. Kjærbeck, & K. Risager (Eds.), *The consequences of mobility: Linguistic and sociocultural contact zones*. Roskilde, Denmark: Roskilde Universitet. Retrieved 13 June, 2019 from https://forskning.ruc.dk/en/publications/languaculture-as-a-key-concept-in-language-and-culture-teaching

Risager, K. (2012). Intercultural learning: Raising cultural awareness. In M. Eisenmann, & T. Summer (Eds.), *Basic issues in EFL teaching and learning*. Universitätsverlag Winter. Retrieved 13 June, 2019 from https://forskning.ruc.dk/en/publications/intercultural-learning-raising-cultural-awareness

Rudby, R. (2015). Unequal Englishes, the native speaker, and decolonization in TESOL. In R. Tupas (Ed.), *Unequal Englishes. The politics of Englishes today* (pp.42-58). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Said, E. (1994). *Culture and imperialism.* Vintage Books: London.

Seidlhofer, B. (2003). *A concept of International English and related issues: From 'real English' to 'realistic English'?* Strasbourg: Council of Europe. Retrieved 18th June, 2018, from:http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.475.6022&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Seidlhofer, B. (2005). English as a lingua franca. *ELT Journal*, *59*(4), 339-341. DOI:10.1093/elt/cci064q

Falla, T., & Davies, P. A. (2017). *Solutions advanced. Student's book*. 3rd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Szönyi, Gy. E. (2014). The mediality of culture. Theories of cultural representations. *Ikon (Journal of Iconographical Studies), 7,* 73-84. Retrieved 7 June, 2019 from https://www.academia.edu/9439690

Takaki, R. (1998). *Strangers from a different shore. A history of Asian Americans.* Updated and revised edition. Boston: Little, Brown.

The Economist, 21st October, 2017. Left behind: The right way to help declining places. In the Lurch: Many places have lost out to globalisation: What can be done?

Valette, R. M. (1986). The culture test. In J. M. Valdes (Ed.), *Culture bound. Bridging the cultural gap in language teaching* (pp.179-198). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vinall, K. (2016). "Got Llorona?" Teaching for the development of symbolic competence. *L2 Journal, 8*(1), 1-16. DOI 10.5070/L28128156

Wierzbicka, A. (1994). 'Cultural scripts': A semantic approach to cultural analysis and cross-cultural communication. In L. F. Bouton, & Y. Kachru (Eds.), P*ragmatics and language learning.* Monograph Series, Volume 5 (pp.1-24). Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois. Retrieved May 21, 2019 from https://fEILes.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED398737.pdf

Author data: Magdolna Kimmel graduated from Kossuth Lajos University, Debrecen, in 1981, and started her career as a teacher of English and History in secondary education. She joined the three-year English teacher education programme of Eötvös Loránd University in 1997. She is still working at Eötvös Loránd University, currently at the Department of English Language Pedagogy. She wrote her PhD dissertation on reflective teacher education. Her main fields of interest are constructivist pedagogy, mentoring, teaching language and culture.